

TIME AND SPACE IN GARCÍA LORCA'S AND CHEKHOV'S RURAL THEATER

LYNN C. PURKEY

University of Tennessee, Chattanooga

A number of critics have noted the parallels between Anton Pavlovich Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard* (*Вишневый сад*, 1903) and what has been called Federico García Lorca's most Chekhovian play, *Doña Rosita la soltera o El lenguaje de las flores* (1935), noting their tragic love triangles, absence of action, and modern use of time (Anderson 151, Doménech 79, Nickle 530, Sánchez 13, Stainton 396, Velázquez Cueto 13, Zaragoza 93).¹ Indeed, the resemblance between the dramatists can

¹ Roberto G. Sánchez feels that it is difficult to prove a case of direct influence between Chekhov and Lorca, but nevertheless sees a «síntesis chejoviana» in *Doña Rosita*, finding that the third act in particular is reminiscent of the horizontal development found in Chekhov and Ibsen (Sánchez 12-13). Leslie Stainton has indicated that the last act of *Doña Rosita* suggests «the structure and tone» of *The Cherry Orchard*, while Jorge Lavelli has posited that *Doña Rosita* shares certain traits with both *The Cherry Orchard* and *The Three Sisters* (*Три сестры*, 1901) (Stainton 396, Zaragoza 93). Nickle sees the connection between *Doña Rosita* and *The Cherry Orchard* in the lack of exterior action and the development of the characters (Nickle 530). Velázquez Cueto has noted the use of the garden or orchard in *Doña Rosita* and *The Cherry Orchard*, in which the dramatic authors bid farewell to a bygone era of delicate sensibilities: «Las dos revoluciones —una realmente nacida, la rusa; otra probablemente reemplazada por un limitado «aggiornamento», la española— se anuncian sobre el escenario en una atmósfera cargada de sugerencias sobre lo inútil, decadente o simplemente delicado de la belleza, de los valores sentimentales, del idealismo; en un marco de jardines [...]» (Velázquez Cueto 13). In an interview with Celia Zaragoza, the Argentine director Jorge Lavelli also noted similarities between Chekhov and Lorca, including the fact that Lorca might have seen Chekhov's works. In particular, he sees a commonality in the ridiculous, which for him is more developed in Lorca than Chekhov, as well as the themes of waiting, frustration, and the search for happiness (Zaragoza 93).

be found to varying degrees in much of their theatrical production, including *Ivanov* (Иванов, 1887), *The Sea Gull* (Чайка, 1896), and *Uncle Vania* (Дядя Ваня, 1899), *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, (1936), *Yerma* (1933), and *Bodas de sangre* (1933).² However, perhaps the most unifying feature of Lorca and Chekhov is their use of space and especially time. In particular the theme of the women against time dominates the action of their plays, suggesting a sociopolitical reading, in which the fecundity and life cycle of women is tied to the regenerative power of the rural landowning class.³ This relationship is revealed by examining Martin Heidegger's and Henri Bergson's writings on time, and Henri Lefebvre's analysis of space, and has important ramifications for the characters' comedic and tragic potential.

I. SPAIN'S RECEPTION OF CHEKHOV

Beginning at the turn of the century Chekhov's narrative fiction enjoyed enormous popularity in Spain, with articles appearing in the most prominent journals and newspapers (*La Lectura*, *El Sol*, *ABC*, *Heraldo de Madrid*, etc.). In 1920, three of the author's most important plays had been translated and published in Spain, including *Uncle Vania*, *The Three Sisters*, and *The Cherry Orchard*. Moreover, Spanish critics had also begun writing of Chekhov's theater and the MAT in such popular periodicals as *La Esfera*, *España*, and *La Vanguardia* by the late 1910s, often highlighting characteristics that would find resonance with García Lorca's theater.

In 1917 the famous theater critic Cristóbal de Castro commented upon the extraordinary women of Chekhov's theater⁴:

² Levy has compared *La casa de Bernarda Alba* and *Three sisters*, proposing a connection based upon circular action time, the preponderance of female characters, the «tension between the common dream and the mode in which each character experiences [...] isolation [...],» as well as the obvious social and historical factors shared by Lorca's Spain and Chekhov's Russia (Levy 203-5). Oleg Moguilnyi and Galina Tamarlí have noted connections between the two playwrights' «aesthetic thought,» based upon the idea that they synthesize various art forms (Moguilnyi 97-98).

³ Joseph W. Zdenek discusses frustrated love in Lorca's dramas, signalling that his complex woman «(1) siempre es trágica, (2) sufre frustrada de amor o de la infecundidad, (3) incorpora el pundonor calderoniano, y (4) es simbólica —representa una sola pasión» (Zdenek 67).

⁴ Stephen Hart has noted the absence of male characters in *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, which resonates with Castro's comments regarding Chekhov (Hart 62).

Antón Tchekoff [...] es su Mesías literario [de la mujer rusa de la clase media], y su admirable comedia de costumbres *Las tres hermanas*, acaso sea lo más completo que sobre las mesócratas rusas se haya escrito. Desechando los vulgarísimos contrastes entre grandes duquesas y campesinas haraposas, entre lujo y miseria, entre luz y sombra, Tchekoff es el primer gran escritor ruso que ha encontrado el matiz de las mujeres de la clase media. Estas mujeres rusas [...] son cosmopolitas.⁵ (Castro)

In 1919, Nicolás Tasin, one of the foremost translators of Russian into Spanish during the early 20th century, lamented the scant knowledge of Chejov's theater abroad. Considering Chekhov's theater «impresionista,» he summarized the plots of his major plays, discussed their general tendencies, as well as their reception (in Russia), and MAT performances (Tasin 12):

[...] como autor dramático [Chejov] puede ser considerado un innovador, un reformador atrevido. Creó un género suyo, en nada semejante al antiguo arte teatral ruso [...]. Sus dramas son pobres de acción, no se encuentran en ellos ni conflictos sensacionales, ni choques trágicos, ni arduas intrigas. Están concebidos con una sencillez asombrosa. Son la vida cotidiana deslizándose ante los ojos del espectador. Y, no obstante, turban, encantan de un modo tan profundo, que dejan al público, durante largo tiempo, impresionado, conmovido. (Tasin 12)

During the 1920s Julio Álvarez del Vayo wrote of Chekhov's theater in *España*, and his two travelogues of Russia. Meeting Olga Knipper and the cast of the MAT during his second trip, he lauded their productions of *Uncle Vania*, *The Three Sisters*, and *The Sea Gull* («Sobre el teatro» 7-8, *Rusia* 96, *La nueva Rusia* 306-09). In his first travelogue, Álvarez noted a new concept of the dramatic, an emphasis on everyday instead of «exceptional» situations, the lack of dramatic action or endings, the theater's «poetry» and melancholia (*La nueva* 306-09).⁶

⁵ Castro reads Chekhov's women as part of the middle class, while it might be more accurate to say they are usually members of the impoverished gentry. Neither Lorca's nor Chekhov's works deal exclusively with the upper classes; but their protagonists are typically members of the rural landowning class. This preoccupation with the rural gentry tends to be more evident in Chekhov's drama than his short stories, which portray positive agents from a wide range of social classes.

⁶ Álvarez del Vayo indicates, «En sus obras, la acción [...] apenas existe. La acción se desarrolla en las almas, y rara vez conduce a una solución definitiva» (*La nueva* 306-07).

Chejoff aportó al teatro un concepto completamente nuevo de lo dramático. En vez de echarse a buscar conflictos a la vida, creando situaciones excepcionales y antagonismos más o menos artificiosos con que impresionarnos, se limitó a llevar a la escena la existencia de todos los días, tal cual es [...] todos esos acontecimientos de la vida ordinaria, él los ha sabido humanizar en tal forma, que llegan a conmovernos mucho más y más hondamente que cualquier desenlace trágico.⁷ (*La nueva* 306)

Such traits would find resonance in Lorca's later dramatic production, especially *La casa de Bernarda Alba* and *Doña Rosita la Soltera*.

Some of Chekhov's most important plays were also produced in Spain during the 1920s and 1930s. Barcelona's Novedades Theater initiated a season of Russian drama in 1926, which included Chekhov's *The Three Sisters* and *Uncle Vania* («Música y teatros» 17). These plays became part of the collective memory of Spain. For example, Azorín (José Martínez Ruiz) discusses the impression these works made upon him («La comedia» 5).⁸ In March of 1932, the Prague Section of the MAT performed *The Cherry Orchard* to critical acclaim at Madrid's Español Theater, which was reviewed in the *Heraldo de Madrid*, *La Libertad*, *El Sol*, and *Luz* by such famous critics as Enrique Díez-Canedo (A.E. 6, Díez-Canedo 8, J.G.O. 5, M.M. 3).⁹ Díez-Canedo remarked upon the subtle nuances, and «el pesimismo re-

⁷ This is essentially the same text that appears in the article, «Sobre el teatro ruso,» in *España*.

⁸ In a 1928 interview with the *Heraldo de Madrid*, Azorín states: «todas estas obras estrenaron en Barcelona —y volvemos a leer—: *El profesor Storitzin*, de Andreiev; *Las tres hermanas*, de Chejov (tres meses después de su estreno en París); *Anafisa*, de Andreiev; *El tío Vania*, de Chejov» («La comedia» 5).

⁹ A review in the Madrid *Luz*, written in 1932 during the fervor of the Second Republic, praised the acting of the performance, but was critical of *The Cherry Orchard*, which it as vulgar and bourgeois (A.E. 6). In contrast, the other reviews are usually complimentary. For example, *La Libertad*, also in 1932, lauds Chekhov's theater: «Y es el de Chejov un teatro de verdaderas obras maestras en su género.» In particular the critic praises *The Cherry Orchard* as having a profound impact upon the field of Russian cultural production: «La última, escrita en 1903, poco antes de la muerte de Chejof, fue *El jardín de los cerezos* comedia famosa entre todas las de aquel país, y a la cual los sucesos, que han cambiado luego la vida de Rusia, vinieron a dar un carácter simbólico y profético de la suerte que ha cabido a la aristocracia rusa, de quien la protagonista de *El jardín de los cerezos* es, en cierto modo, trasunto y prototipo» (M.M. 3). Similarly, Díez-Canedo wrote a favorable review in *El Sol* in 1932, commenting upon the well executed acting, as well as Chekhov's representation of a passing era in *The Cherry Orchard* (Díez-Canedo 8). J.G.O., writing for the *Heraldo de Madrid*, favorable compared Chekhov to the coetaneous Benito Pérez Galdós, and *That the Cherry Orchard* to *El abuelo* (J.G.O. 5).

signado de Chejov se muestra en acciones quietas, de sentido poemático, más que de pugna y choque de caracteres» (Díez-Canedo 8). At the same time, the Spanish Press was well informed of Russian émigré productions of Chekhov's work (Barga 4). For example, Alberto Insúa reported essentially the same information on George Pitoeff's 1921 Paris performance of *Uncle Vania* in *El Imparcial* and *La correspondencia de España* (Insúa, «Los rusos» 7, «De Van Dongen» 2).

As Moguilnyi and Tamarlí have pointed out, critics began connecting Chekhov and Lorca's work as early as the 1930s (Moguilnyi 97). According to the Russian critics, Díez-Canedo was the first to connect *Doña Rosita* and Chekhov's *oeuvre*, a view supported by Manuel Altolaguirre, who credits Díez-Canedo with saying that *Doña Rosita* «Parece una buena comedia de Chejov» (Altolaguirre 36, Moguilnyi 97). Although there is scant mention of Chekhov in Lorca's writings and interviews, Lorca had read Chekhov's works as a child and possibly saw the Le Gallienne productions of *The Cherry Orchard* and *The Sea Gull* in New York, which were based on the MAT performances of the early 1920s (Moguilnyi 97, Stainton 396, Zaragoza 93).

II. TIME IN RELATION TO BERGSON AND HEIDEGGER

One of the most unifying features of Chekhov and Lorca's works is time, especially the theme of women's struggle against time.¹⁰ Indeed at least three uses of time are evident in these works: a sense of dramatic time passing in concert with the audience's perception of «real» time, the fusion of past, present, and future times, and an existential concern for the future. Examining these works through Bergson's writings on time and free will demonstrates how the authors create dramatic time that gives the perception of being syn-

¹⁰ A number of critics have discussed time in both dramatic authors. Frost has noted that Chekhov's works depict an «almost constant struggle [...] between the limiting effect of time and the limitlessness of eternity, with the balance tipped heavily in favor of the former» (Frost 111). In his Bakhtinian reading of Chekhov's drama, Martin Nag has noted the importance of place and time for his last four plays, stating that the reader experiences them as «a poetic and psychological manifestation of time and place of *polyphonic* effect and value» (Nag 23, original emphasis). Specifically, he theorizes that Chekhov (and Ibsen) had «one main intention in common, namely that the time and place aspect of *reality* in a psychological and organic way must find its equivalence in the time and place aspect of *fictional writing*» (Nag 32, original emphasis).

chronic to the actual passage of time. Although he is at odds with Bergson, Heidegger's existential writings on temporality reveal the mixing of past, present, and future, and the subject's overwhelming preoccupation with the latter. Viewing Chekhov's and Lorca's plays through these lenses reveals a connection in regards to time.

As F.L. Pogson notes in his preface to Bergson's *Time and Free Will*, for the French philosopher there is a disconnect between mathematical measurements of intensity or duration (time) and the «natural attitude» or «specific feelings» perceived by the «consciousness.» Bergson demonstrates that only «magnitudes» or space can be measured quantitatively and that «intensity» or duration/time is «purely qualitative,» concluding that «Homogeneous and measurable time is shown to be an artificial concept, formed by the intrusion of the idea of space into the realm of pure duration» (Pogson xi). Bergson's understanding of time is relevant to the audience's perception of temporality in Lorca and Chekhov, as it points to ways in which they create a dramatic rhythm that coincides with the audience's perception of time.

In contrast with Bergson's emphasis on the consciousness's perception of time, which is beyond mathematical measurement, Heidegger posits the interrelatedness of time and being and their ultimate connection with death and finitude. Rather than a demarcated chronological view of time, the German existentialist sees it as a fluid continuum of the present, past, and future, which exist simultaneously, intimately interwoven within the fabric of every-day human existence or being, *Da-sein* or *Dasein*. The term is a blend of the two words *da* (there or here) and *sein* (to be; being) and has been translated as «existence» or «entity»; it is roughly equivalent to «subject» or «human being» (Johnson 14). While *Geschichtlichkeit*, the past or historicity, is always with one in the sense that one is aware of the past, the future is the temporality that governs man's own awareness of his existence, because he is always projecting himself into the future:

The formal existential totality of the ontological structural whole of *Da-sein* must thus be formulated in the following structure: The being of *Da-sein* means being-ahead-of-oneself-already-in (the world) as being-together-with (innerworldly beings encountered). This being fills in the significance of the term *care*, which is used in a purely ontological and existential way. Any ontically intended tendency of being, such as worry

or carefreeness, is ruled out. (Heidegger 179-80, original emphasis)

In Chekhov's and Lorca's rural dramas one sees the mixing of the past, present, and future, as well as the temporal projection of the future dominating the lives of women. At the same time the viewer perceives dramatic time as if it were the passage of «real» time during the performance of each act (this does not account for the time between acts).

III. REAL VS. DRAMATIC TIME

One of Chekhov's most important innovations in theater was the use of a more natural aesthetic that mimicked everyday life, particularly in regards to his use of time. As a number of critics have suggested, the Russian playwright creates a «natural» or «realistic» sense of time passing, a technique which is achieved through extensive pauses and silences and through the absence of external action, which is replaced by development of the character's inner world (*La nueva Rusia* 306-9, Berdnikov 7, Cate 94, Greenfield 311, Jones 111, Proehl 104, Tasin 12).¹¹ Francie Cate has related the natural use of time in Lorca to the interminable waiting of *Doña Rosita*, and Kathleen Dolan, who has posited a negation of time in plays from 1934-36 (*Yerma*, *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, *Doña Rosita*), notes that large pauses and silences are widely employed during this latter period of his production (Cate 95-99, Dolan 514). Dru Dougherty has observed the use of silences in Lorca to convey meaning, while Sumner Greenfield has suggested a general lack of action in Lorca's later theater, a trait that Jiménez-Vera sees in *Doña Rosita* (Dougherty 89, Greenfield 311, Jiménez-Vera 133).

Indeed, both Chekhov and García Lorca create a sense of time passing that approximates what the audience perceives as actual time. This tendency can be related to Bergson's theory of time and free will and stresses the importance of the consciousness's perception of time. Bergson states:

There is a real duration, the heterogeneous moments of which permeate one another; each moment, however, can be brought into relation with a state in the external world which is contem-

¹¹ Proehl characterized the passage of time in *The Seagull* as relentless and progressive (Proehl 104).

poraneous with it, and can be separated from the other moments in consequence of this very process. The comparison of these two realities gives rise to a symbolic representation of duration, derived from space. (Bergson 110).

However, time can only be perceived through consciousness, as «duration [...] has no moments which are identical or external to one another,» and «there is neither duration, nor even succession in space,» except in the manner in which the consciousness «retain[s] them and set[s] them side by side by externalizing them in relation to one another» (Bergson 120-21). Moreover, one's consciousness perceives a sense of simultaneous time of both real and imagined events, because it synthesizes «successive positions,» and thus perceives states which «permeate one another,» and «imperceptibly organize themselves into a whole [...] by this very process of connection» (Bergson 112, 121). Thus, if one applies Bergson's theory, audiences of Chekhov's dramatic *oeuvre* and Lorca's later drama perceive two simultaneous successions of time, their own experience of viewing the play and the dramatic action as it occurs on stage, which they perceive as permeating each other and fusing together.

IV. THE FUSION OF PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

The nostalgic elements of Chekhov and García Lorca, the reminiscences of better times, permit the mixing of the past with the present, while the ever present economic and marriage concerns project into the future. Critics have commented upon the unique treatment of time in Lorca and Chekhov, noting that it is significantly different from classical theater. Jones, for example, concludes that the perception of past, present and future time are mixed in Chekhov, while Michele Frucht Levy notes their confluence in *La casa de Bernarda Alba* and *The Three Sisters* (Jones 111, Levy 210-11). Jones further comments, «In shifting his ground and viewing time from various vantage points, the narrator creates a complex pattern which underpins the characterization, directs the flow of mood, and [...] determines the plot-less nature» in Chekhov's work (Jones 112).

Indeed the past, present, and future intermingle in *The Cherry Orchard* and *Doña Rosita* in a number of ways. In the first act of the former, Firs blends the present and the past, reminiscing about the master travelling to Paris, as the family returns from it, and Madam

Ranevskaja and Gaev reminisce about the nursery and an old cupboard that brings back childhood memories (Chekhov *Vol. 9* 614-15, 616). The future is also ever present in the family's preoccupation with money, the mortgage, and their destiny, especially that of Varia, perhaps *The Cherry Orchard's* greatest victim. Arturo Jiménez-Vera sees a similar technique in Lorca, noting «the mixing of the elements of time, that is, while the action unfolds in the present, it simultaneously brings to mind memories of the past or thoughts of the future» (Jiménez-Vera 132). In particular he points out the merging of the future and present when Doña Rosita meets with the three old maids in Act II, who are a portend of her future, the younger Ayola sisters, who are her past. Another such instance takes place in Act III, when a childhood friend visits in which the present and past are mixed as they reminisce about their youth, and she sees what her life could have been (Jiménez-Vera 132).¹²

V. CYCLICAL TIME, DRAMATIC STRUCTURE, AND THE FUTURE

The comingling of past, present, and future is reinforced by cyclical time made manifest in a number of ways in many of Chekhov's and Lorca's plays. In *Doña Rosita* and *The Cherry Orchard* agricultural allegories serve as organizing structures that presage the protagonists' future. In the case of the former, the *rosa mutabilis*, a type of shrub rose that changes color, reflects the life cycle of the protagonist, whose name is an obvious diminutive of *rosa* or rose. In the latter, the eponymous cherry orchard shows the passage of the seasons, indicative of the natural life cycle.¹³

Doña Rosita la soltera is divided into acts that are separated from

¹² Jiménez-Vera has indicated: «One example the mixing of time is seen in Act II when doña Rosita socializes with three old maids. In essence, the present represented by doña Rosita and the future by the spinsters are seen side by side and thus provide us with a point of reference on what to expect for her. Another example is taken from Act III when the son of a friend from her youth calls on her. Here doña Rosita is identified with the present, and her association through the boy with his mother takes us back to the past when both were young and looked forward to marriage» (Jiménez-Vera 132).

¹³ Sagarra has indicated the cherry orchard's importance for Lubov and Gaev: «El cerezal es mucho más que un pretexto dramático [...]. Para los hermanos, Lubov y Gáiev, el cerezal representa sus raíces —la aristocracia rural—, su infancia, una infinita prolongación de 'la habitación de los niños', y, al mismo tiempo, un paisaje fantasmagórico: Lubov ve entre las ramas de los cerezos el fantasma de su madre [...]. Y, a la vez un paisaje de muerte inexorable» (Sagarra 27).

one another by long periods of time.¹⁴ The play begins in Act I with the famous parallel between Doña Rosita and the *rosa mutabilis*, which projects the positive agent's future as empty and unfulfilled. As critics beginning with the initial reviews of the play in the mid 1930s have pointed out, Rosita's likeness to the rose is symbolized both by her name and by the color of her clothes in each scene, which reflect the blooming pattern of the *rosa mutabilis* (Anderson 153-55, Colecchia 37, Doménech 80, Febres 99, Haro 1, Hernández 298-301, Jiménez-Vera 127-29, Nickle 522, Velázquez 13). In his 1935 review of the play, Eduardo Haro indicated the symbolic *romance* of the «la rosa mudable,» first told by Rosa's uncle (Haro 1). Variants of the poem are repeated throughout the play, as are references to roses and flowers:

Cuando se abre en la mañana
roja como sangre está. [...]
Abierta en el mediodía
es dura como el coral. [...]
y se desmaya la tarde
en las violetas del mar,
se pone blanca, con blanco
de una mejilla de sal.
Y cuando toca la noche [...]
en la raya de lo oscuro
se comienza a deshojar. (*Doña Rosita* 16-17)

As Anderson indicates, the changing color of the rose and the time of day parallel Rosita, both in her aging and the color of her clothes:

The fundamental relationship between the flower in the 'rose poem' and the life of Doña Rosita is quite transparent. The rare *rosa mutabilis* that is described passes through all of its phases in the space of one day (morning, midday, dusk, night), changing from bud, to bloom, to full blown, to withered and dropping its petals, while correspondingly turning in colour from bright red to white. The rose's day is figuratively equated to the whole span of Rosita's life, and hence each comes to mirror the other: Rosita's age, her physical appearance, and the colour of her various dresses are paralleled in the symbolic un-

¹⁴ Turner has noted a similar phenomenon in *The Three Sisters* (Turner 65).

derpinning of the rose leitmotiv. Furthermore, the three acts of the play take place, respectively, during the morning, afternoon, and evening of three separate days in Rosita's life, each many years apart: telescoped together into the few hours of the running-time of the play's performance, they simultaneously suggest a single, composite day and the twenty-five years that elapse according to the text's internal chronology. (Anderson 153-54, original spelling)¹⁵

Thus, in Acts I and II, Rosita is dressed in rose pink, but in Act III, Scene I she is dressed in pale rose, and in the last scene of the play (Act III, Scene II) she is dressed in white, symbolically indicating that her youth and beauty have faded. The image of vanishing beauty is also supported by the style of dress she wears and reflects her financial circumstances; in the first two acts her dress is fashionable, but in the last act, her clothes are out of style.

The connection between flowers, spinsterhood, and death occurs even earlier than the first mention of the *rosa mutabilis*, at the point when the housekeeper equates flowers to nuns and death: «A mí las flores me huelen a niño muerto, a la profesión de monja, o a altar de iglesia. A cosas tristes» (*Doña Rosita* 10-11). Flowers are obviously a metonymic device for Rosita, and this is a portent of the «sad» things to come: Rosa's social and physical «death» and her nun-like existence. As Luis Fernández Cifuentes notes, the paradigm of mutation and physical deterioration is foreseen from the first act of the play, a prolepsis, emphasizing Rosita's undesirable fate. The housekeeper says that when she was a little girl she would tell her what she would be like when she was older: eighty years of age, single, and still sewing her wedding dress (Fernández Cifuentes 325).

In the same way that flowers function in *Doña Rosita*, Chekhov's cherry orchard serves as an organizing structure and as a portent of things to come.¹⁶ However, while the three acts of *Doña Rosita* takes

¹⁵ Anderson synthesizes the articles from Febres and Jiménez-Vera here. Febres notes, «Lo que se observa en este drama es precisamente una estructura encuadrada en cuatro momentos, la cual estructura representa dos cosas. Primero, muestra los cuatro estadios diferentes de la temporalidad de la rosa que se llama mutábil [...] Y segundo, proyecta las cuatro fases de la vida, tanto interior como exterior de la protagonista, de quien la rosa con su duración de cuatro etapas es símbolo [...]» (Febres 99).

¹⁶ Martin Nag has connected the acts of *The Cherry Orchard* with seasons and sometimes, the time of day, with Act I in May at 2 A.M., with the day dawning, Act II before sunset some time after Act I, Act III after another ellipses, and Act IV in October. He sees the first three acts as exhibiting a unity of time and place, and the last as sep-

place over several decades, 1885, 1900, 1911, represented in the three times of the day in each of the three acts (Devoto 408-09), *The Cherry Orchard's* four acts takes place in the space of a few months, separating different seasons, which reflect the seasons of a woman's life, as do the three female protagonists: spring/youth, summer/maturity, fall/middle-age with the first act beginning in early Spring: «Уже май, цветут вишневые деревья, но в саду холодно» [It is already May; the cherry trees are blooming, but it is cold in the orchard] (Chekhov *Vol. 9* 608).¹⁷ Two other harbingers of spring include the cherry trees in bloom and birds singing in the garden (608, 613). Act II takes place at some point during the summer before the sale of the house on August 22 (636). Indications of summer include the outdoor setting of much of the act and Sharlotta eating a cucumber (625). Act III occurs on the date of the estate sale, August 22, while Act IV is in October (641, 652). This coincides with the season of harvest, which is obviously symbolic of waning fertility and the family's socioeconomic position, which corresponds with the chopping of the cherry orchard sounding in the background (653).

The destruction of the orchard and the family's decline is also foreshadowed explicitly in the play, beginning in the first scene with Lopakhin's announcement regarding the sale and clearing of the cherry orchard (Velázquez 13). This devastation is corroborated in the romantic affairs of the three women. Madam Ranevskia ends the play returning to her faithless lover, Ania marries the penniless Trofimov, and Varia will end her life as a spinster/housekeeper. Like Doña Rosita, Varia's empty future is foreshadowed from the first act of the play, when Madam Ranevskia states she is «на монашку похожа» [like a nun], an idea that is reinforced with references to nuns and nunneries, especially when Varia's love interest Lopakhin equates her to *Hamlet's* Ophelia, telling her, «иди в монастырь» [get thee to a nunnery] (Chekhov *Vol. 9* 610, 635, 641).

As the rose, the change in seasons, and metonymic device of the cherry orchard suggest cyclical time, and the four acts of the play suggest the four seasons, although they do not correspond directly

arate, which creates an 'anti-dramatic' dynamic» (Nag 29-32). Jones notes the intricate ordering of time in Chekhov's drama, which directs the flow of mood (Jones 112).

¹⁷ Jones also indicates that Gaev, Lopakhin, Trofimov, and possibly Firs «represent a generation prepared to serve Lyubov' Andreyevna in the different ways of past, present, and future [...]» (Jones 117). Therefore, Chekhov's male characters also demonstrate cyclical time much as the women of the play do.

to them. The temperature of three degrees used to open and close the play also reinforces the notion of circular time. Towards the end of the play, Lopakhin mentions that at the same time last year it was already «градуса три мороза» [about three degrees below freezing], echoing Epikhodov's «мороз в три градуса» [three degrees below freezing] at the beginning of the play (659, 609).

The cyclical time suggested by agricultural metaphors is intimately connected with the aging female body, evident in women at various ages as one sees in the Ranevskii, Prozorov, the Alba women, and Doña Rosita. It is also evident in the repetition of events, such as the pattern of violence and death in *Bodas de sangre*, illustrated by the mother-in-law, who has lost a husband and two sons, and the bride who follows in her footsteps.¹⁸ This gives a sense of the vicious cycle of recurring violence in rural Spain, a «continuous cycle of creation and decay,» in which «action is circular,» which Levy has noted in *La casa de Bernarda Alba* and *The Three Sisters* (Levy 203-04).

García Lorca's brother Francisco has commented that the most important character of *Doña Rosita* is time (Fernández Cifuentes 323).¹⁹ Women's struggle with time is particularly apparent in this work and *The Cherry Orchard*, but it is also present in a number of the two dramatists' plays, including *Ivanov*, *The Three Sisters*, *Uncle Vania*, *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, *Yerma*, and *Bodas de sangre*. The women of these plays waste their lives waiting for the future with its potential for happiness through marriage (or children), which ensures their financial security. Ultimately thwarted by time and their inability or unwillingness to act, they are condemned to ruin in their incapacity to marry (Doña Rosita, the Alba sisters, Varía of *The Cherry Orchard*, Olga, and Irina of *The Three Sisters*, and Sonia in *Uncle Vania*), or through unwise, loveless, or childless relationships (*Ivanov*, *The Cherry Orchard*, *The Three Sisters*, *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, and *Yerma*).

¹⁸ In *Bodas de sangre* one might argue that time has run out in the case of the mother in law. Her husband is dead and her two sons have been killed, leaving her too old for more children. In this sense, the theme of a projected time running out is also present, although she is a secondary figure.

¹⁹ According to Francisco García Lorca, «Hay también un personaje mudo, el más importante: el tiempo» (Fernández Cifuentes 323).

VI. WOMEN AGAINST TIME

Their failure to contract a successful marriage is significant for three reasons: marriage is one of the few accepted roles open for women of the rural gentry, a «good» marriage guarantees financial security, and unhappily married women might find fulfillment in children; however, of the three, economics are paramount. In *The Cherry Orchard*, Varia clarifies the relationship between marriage and finances at this critical juncture, stating to Ania, «Выдать бы тебя за богатого человека, и я бы тогда была покойной» [If only we could marry you off to a rich man, I would be at peace] (Chekhov Vol. 9 612). Moreover, throughout the play, she attempts to separate Ania from the penniless Trofimov for obvious reasons. The plot of *Bodas de sangre* is driven by the tension between passion or instinct and financial concerns, as the bride reveals to her mother-in-law: «Yo era una mujer quemada, llena de llagas por dentro y por fuera, y tu hijo era un poquito de agua de la que yo esperaba hijos, tierra, salud [...]» (*Bodas* 162).²⁰

Besides time, finances serve as the other antagonists for Chekhov's and Lorca's rural women. In *La casa de Bernarda Alba* the combustible mixture of finances and age serve as a catalyst for Adela's suicide and is responsible for Pepe el Romano's unnatural engagement to the much older Angustias. However, despite the fact that time is an antagonist, it also holds potential —the potential to achieve the desired match and become a reproductive and financial success.

VII. RURAL AND REPRODUCTIVE SPACE

Intimately connected to the issue of time, space orders human existence. This is true of the occupied space known intimately and the larger imagined community, which can only be inferred. In Chekhov the familiar rural space is contrasted with the absent idealized space of the cosmopolitan center and serves as an ironic element as well as a limit to the protagonists' and the works' scope and potential. In addition to a poetic, idyllic setting, the rural space becomes a point of frustration, interfering with the quixotic or oblomovian characters' abilities to find eligible suitors with whom they might

²⁰ Colecchia has noted that Lorca's works are frequently characterized by violent outbursts of passion (Colecchia 38).

procreate and regenerate their social class, although this is less evident in *Doña Rosita* than in Chekhov's *oeuvre*. Instead, the characters of *The Cherry Orchard* (and most of Chekhov's drama) and *Doña Rosita la soltera* are tragicomedic figures, at once victims and creators of their own destiny.

Without ignoring the works' sociological concerns, Miguel García-Posada points out that there are a number of reasons, most of which are not mutually exclusive, that Lorca might have chosen a «rural drama,» including the commercial success and public preference for rural dramas in Spain and the success of Benaventes's sociological plays (García-Posada 157). Joan de Sagarra indicates that in *The Cherry Orchard* the clash between the two Russias is an indicator of the conflict between the symbolic, useless world of a bygone age and modern capitalism, which might also be said regarding the decline of Doña Rosita's family in Spain (Sagarra 27).

In *The Production of Space*, Henri Lefebvre argues that space, society, and political and economic systems are closely tied (Lefebvre 8-9). Certainly it can be no accident that García Lorca and Chekhov have chosen the countryside, with its rigid social conventions and strict sexual economy to describe the rise of industrial modes of production and the material and the physical decadence of the petty nobility made manifest in the aging female body.²¹

In Chekhov's and García Lorca's rural drama most of the action takes place within the confines of a rural estate, typically within the structure of the home itself, with the notable exceptions of *Bodas de sangre* and *Yerma*, in which scenes also take place within the community. Thus, most of the action transpires in what Lefebvre terms the «reproductive space,» where rural women spent much of their time, particularly in Spain, as a number of public spaces were prohibited for single women. Lefebvre notes that «in precapitalist societies the two interlocking levels of biological reproduction and socio-economic production together constituted social reproduction—that is to say, the reproduction of society as it perpetuated itself generation after generation» (Lefebvre 32). He connects the reproductive space to male and female sexual symbols, age, and nature:

²¹ Hart's psychological reading of *La Casa de Bernarda Alba*, views Bernarda and Adela as victims of «phallocratic» society (Hart 68).

[...] social space also contains specific representations of this double or triple interaction between the social relations of production and reproduction. Symbolic representation serves to maintain these social relations in a state of coexistence and cohesion. It displays them while displacing them—and thus concealing them in symbolic fashion—with the help of, and onto the backdrop of, nature. Representations of the relations of reproduction are sexual symbols, symbols of male and female, sometimes accompanied, sometimes not, by symbols of age—of youth and of old age. (Lefebvre 32-33)

According to Lefebvre one requirement of social space is that «the family [...] be rejected as sole centre or focus of social practice, [...] but at the same time that it be retained and maintained as the 'basis' of personal and direct relationships which are bound to nature, to the earth, to procreation, and thus to reproduction» (Lefebvre 34-35). Thus, biological and socio-economic production are bound together, which is evident in the female body at various ages in most of Lorca's and Chekhov's rural dramas, and occasionally the men in Chekhov's plays as one sees in Gaev, Yasha, Lopakhin and Firs in *The Cherry Orchard* (Jones 117). These are tied to the symbols of nature, the *rosa mutabilis* and times of the day in *Doña Rosita* and the seasons and trees of *The Cherry Orchard*. Moreover, this social structure at times reduces women to their biological function and confines them to the reproductive sphere, a trait more evident in Lorca, especially in *La casa de Bernarda Alba* and *Yerma*, but also apparent in the financial restrictions of the Prozorov sisters and of Varia.

In contrast with precapitalist society, Lefebvre finds three interrelated levels of space in capitalist society: «(1) *biological reproduction* (the family); (2) *the reproduction of labour power* (the working class *per se*); and (3) *the reproduction of the social relations of production*—that is, of those relations which are constitutive of capitalism» (Lefebvre 32, original emphasis).

Although perceived as separate, they are intertwined. In these dramas it is the clash of precapitalist and capitalist modes of production that result in the precarious financial positions in which the women find themselves. Mired in tradition and a past way of life, the protagonists are at once victims of new modes of social and biological production and the perpetrators of their own failure.

Lorca's treatment of space mirrors that of Chekhov, but was probably not because of any direct influence. As mentioned above, rural theatrical works were popular in Spain at the time, and Lorca as a

native of Granada felt a strong connection with the land he portrayed. Moreover, both Spain and Russia were slower to develop than most of Western Europe, and both were in the process of difficult transitions from agrarian to industrial modes of production.

VIII. TIME, SPACE, AND CHARACTER POTENTIAL

Nevertheless, Lorca's theater was in dialogue with Chekhov's dramatic innovations especially in his use of time, and while a number of his rural plays share characteristics with the Russian playwright's new type of drama, *Doña Rosita* is the work that most closely captures Chekhov's tone. Most of the two authors' rural theater record this transition from precapitalist society to industrialization through female protagonists; however, neither in Chekhov's plays nor in *Doña Rosita* is this due to any overwhelmingly feminist feelings —nor is it due to antifeminist sentiments, for that matter. The comic elements of *Doña Rosita* and *The Cherry Orchard* undermine a feminist reading, despite the fact that the social ridicule that characters like Rosita and Varia suffer is tragic in its own way. On one level, the depiction of these women is indicative of the rural landowning class's inability to reproduce itself and survive the shift to modern industrialization. In the female body, the dramatists synthesize the corruption of flesh, the decline of a social class, and the end of an era: the movement from pre-capitalism to capitalism has left these protagonists on the margins of society, incapable of adapting to the new bourgeois order.

Yet *Doña Rosita* and *The Cherry Orchard* are polysemantic, lending themselves to other interpretations. As will be argued in greater detail below, time and space relate directly to the potential for different readings from a systems' point of view. In Chekhov's and Lorca's major rural works space frustrates the characters' potential to change their world. As it limits the protagonists' access to the marriage market, the rural setting also restricts the work to the local rather than the global sphere: the failures of *Doña Rosita*, *Varia*, or *Madame Ranevskia* have no lasting effect beyond their family or individual circumstances. Even death is powerless to change their fictional worlds: Firs's eminent demise is so unremarkable that the family pays it no heed, abandoning him in the boarded-up house; *Doña Rosita's* uncle's death has no perceptible impact beyond the immediate family.

In contrast, time, despite its role as antagonist, is an area in which characters have greater potential agency. Vera Zubarev, who applies systems theory to literature, posits that Chekhov «signified a new era of thinking [...] now known as systems thinking,» maintaining that his radical swerve is based upon the potential or predisposition of characters and their inner development rather than an Aristotelian emphasis on action or characters' behavior («Chekhov» 2). As might be inferred from the remarks of critics, including Lorca's contemporaries, one finds some of the same tendencies in many of his theatrical productions, particularly later works such as *Doña Rosita* and *La casa de Bernarda Alba*. The absence of action and the interior development of characters is intimately related to time in *Doña Rosita* and *The Cherry Orchard*, shedding light on the characters' potential for changing their world in contrast with their oblo-movian inertia.

The slow action of these plays, which mimics the passage of real time, creates a sensation of suspense, in which the spectator waits for the protagonists to act, but nothing happens. This emphasizes the positive agents' potential to change their environment and highlights their reluctance to do so. For example, in Félix Lope de Vega y Carpio's *Fuenteovejuna*, when faced with rape, Laurencia rallies the town to defeat the *comendador*, eventually freeing the town of his tyranny. In *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, although she acts ignobly (becoming pregnant by her sister's fiancé) and forfeits her life, Adela demonstrates tremendous agency and strength of will. In contrast, the protagonists of *The Cherry Orchard* and *Doña Rosita* are mired in tradition: Varia might suggest to Lopakhin that they marry; Madame Ranevskaja might sell the orchard and preserve a portion of her fortune, and Doña Rosita might call off her engagement before she loses her looks and her uncle seals their economic ruin paying for her trousseau. Cyclical time (agricultural metaphors, seasons, and times of the day) and the fusion of the past, present, and future bring to mind the repeating tragicomedy of women against time, women who foresee an undesirable future, but do nothing to realize their potential.

In addition, time also relates to the works' relationship to Aristotelian tragedy and comedy. Lorca classified most of his rural theatrical works as tragedies (*Bodas de sangre*, *Yerma*, and *La casa de Bernarda Alba*), yet designated *Doña Rosita la soltera* a *tragicomedia*. In contrast, Chekhov labeled *The Cherry Orchard* a comedy, although it

has been interpreted as a drama. An example of this may be seen in a letter written to Olga Knipper dated April 10, 1904, in which Chekhov complains about the misconception of *The Cherry Orchard* as a drama: («Почему на афишах и в газетных объявлениях моя пьеса так упорно называются драмой? Немирович и Алексеев [Станиславский] в моей пьесе видят положительно не то, что я написал [...]» [«Why is it that on posters and in the newspaper advertisements my play is so stubbornly called a drama? Nemirovich and Alekseev [Stanislavsky] see in my play something that is not at all what I have written [...]»] (Chekhov Vol. 12 533). Different readings of *The Cherry Orchard* as early as its first production are indicative of its multivalent potential, of what Zubarev might call the work's multilateral perspective. Her systems analysis approach, which examines different systems for creating meaning within the work, is based upon the «protagonist's ability to influence his/her world's development» and their predisposition, among which *The Cherry Orchard* and *Doña Rosita* might be interpreted as dramas (average or above average potential) or perhaps quasi-dramas («The Comic» 6).

Although their authors announce their limited potential in the titles (comedy, tragicomedy), the protagonists of *The Cherry Orchard* range from very weak to average, with a group potential of quasi-strong, while *Doña Rosita* is quasi-strong. Varia and *Doña Rosita* do not change their world, but neither are quite as foolish and shallow as Madame Ranevskaja nor as naïve as Ania. Varia sees what the future will hold, attempting to frustrate the budding romance between Ania and Trofimov, while Madame Ranevskaja is doomed to repeat the imprudent mistakes of the past (returning to the lover who stole money, financial misdealing, etc.). Although she suggests that Varia marry Lopakhin, Madame Ranevskaja's attitude is so cavalier, that the audience cannot believe that she is seriously concerned, especially if one takes into account the fact that she does nothing to help Varia, and her imprudent attitude toward her daughter and Trofimov. In a similar way, Ania's youth and inexperience do not allow her to see the mistake of a marriage to the weak Trofimov. In contrast, Varia's potential for seeing the global situation of her environment explains why she is more tragic (sad), and why she has greater potential as a character, despite her greater economic limitations and her refusal to act. *Doña Rosita*, who had known for some time that her fiancé would never return, also has a stronger potential than Madame Ranevskaja, Ania, or the three spinster sisters, who ignore their fate.

One should also note that ridicule in *Doña Rosita* is usually reserved for other characters (the three spinsters and their mother), and that she is more tragic (sad) than comic, giving her slightly less comedic (funny) potential than Varia, whom other characters mock (e.g., the comments about nuns). Yet, hampered by society and their location, Varia and Doña Rosita are too timid, too proud, or perhaps too imprudent to transform their environment.

Time and space represent major convergences in Chekhov's and Lorca's theater, although, as mentioned above, the utilization of rural space is simply too broad to represent anything beyond a like response to sociopolitical shifts and a factor that limits the characters' potential. The absence of exterior action and the reliance on the interior development of characters represents another point of contact. In terms of tone, the mixture of laughter and sadness, *Doña Rosita* best approximates the polysemantic system approach to drama created by Chekhov, lending itself to multiple interpretations as its title suggests.

WORKS CITED

- Altolaguirre, Manuel. «Nuestro teatro.» *Hora de España* IX (Sept., 1937): 31-37.
- Álvarez del Vayo, Julio. *La nueva Rusia*. 2nd ed. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1926.
- . *Rusia a los doce años*. 2nd ed. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1929.
- . «Sobre el teatro ruso.» *España* (Nov. 25, 1922): 7-8.
- Anderson, Andrew. «More Sources for García Lorca's *Doña Rosita la soltera*.» *The Discerning Eye: Studies Presented to Robert Pring-Mill on His Seventieth Birthday*. Ed. Nigel Griffen, Clive Griffen, Eric Southworth and Colin Thompson. Langranog, Wales: The Dolphin Book Co., 1994.
- Anon. «Música y teatros.» *La Vanguardia* (Jan. 14, 1926): 17.
- Anon. «La comedia de la felicidad estaba ya traducida del ruso.» *Heraldo de Madrid* (Feb. 2, 1928): 5.
- Barga, Corpus. «El teatro en París.» *El Sol* (Feb. 28, 1923): 4-5.
- Berdnikov, Georgi. «Chekhov and Our Time.» *Soviet Literature* 1 (1980): 3-11.
- Bergson, Henri. *Time and Free Will. An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness*. Trans. F.L. Pogson. Edinburgh: Riverside Press, 1950.
- Castro, Cristóbal de. «Mujeres modernas: Las rusas.» *La esfera* (Apr. 14, 1917).
- Cate, Francie. «Los motivos de la espera y la esperanza en *Yerma* y *Doña Rosita la soltera*.» *García Lorca Review* 10.2 (Spring, 1982): 94-113.
- Chekhov, A. P. *Sobranie sochinenii*. Vols. 9, 12. V.V. Ermilov, K.D. Muratovaia, E.S. Papernyi, and A. I. Rebiakin, eds. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo Khudozhestvennoi Literatury, 1963.
- Colecchia, Frances. «Doña Rosita – una heroína aparte.» *Duquesne Hispanic Review* 7.2 (1968): 37-43.
- Devoto, Daniel. «*Doña Rosita la soltera*: Estructura y fuentes.» *Bulletin Hispanique* 69 (1967): 407-35.

- Díez-Canedo, E. «Teatros: Compañía rusa: *El jardín de los cerezos*, de Chéjov.» *El Sol* (March 10, 1932): 8.
- Dolan, Kathleen. «Time, Irony and Negation in Lorca's Last Three Plays.» *Hispania* 63.3 (Sept. 1980): 514-22.
- Doménech, Ricardo. «Nueva indagación en *Doña Rosita la soltera*.» *Anales de la Literatura Española Contemporánea* 11.1-2 (1986): 79-90.
- Dougherty, Dru. «El lenguaje del silencio en el teatro de García Lorca.» *Anales de la Literatura Española Contemporánea* 11.1-2 (1986): 91-110.
- E., A. «*El jardín de los cerezos* de Antón Chejov.» *Luz* (March 10, 1932): 6.
- Febres, Eleodoro J. «El problema estructural de *Doña Rosita la soltera*.» *Sin Nombre: Revista Trimestral Literaria* 10.2 (1979): 98-111.
- Fernández Cifuentes, Luis. «*Doña Rosita la soltera o El lenguaje de las flores*.» *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos: Revista Mensual de Cultura Hispánica* 433-34 (1986): 319-40.
- Frost, Edgar L. «The Search for Eternity in Chekhov's fiction: The Flight from Time as a Source of Tension.» *Russian Language Journal* 108 (1977): 111-20.
- G.O., J. «Por la tarde, la comedia *Un señor*, de Jordán de Urries, en el María Isabel. Por la noche, *El jardín de cerezos*, de Chejov, por la compañía Teatro de Arte de Moscú.» *Heraldo de Madrid* (March 3, 1932): 5.
- García Lorca, Federico. *Bodas de sangre*. Allen Josephs & Juan Caballero, eds. 14th ed. Madrid: Cátedra, 2000.
- García Lorca, Federico. *Doña Rosita la soltera o El lenguaje de las flores*. 7th ed. Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada, 1966.
- García Lorca, Federico. *Obras III: Teatro I*. Miguel García-Posada, ed. Madrid: Ediciones Akal, 1996.
- García-Posada, Miguel. «Realidad y transfiguración artística en *La casa de Bernarda Alba*.» *La Casa de Bernarda Alba y el teatro de García Lorca*. Ricardo Doménech, ed. Madrid: Cátedra, 1980. 149-70.
- Greenfield, Sumner. «*Doña Rosita la soltera* y la poetización del tiempo.» *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos: Revista Mensual de Cultura Hispánica* 433-34 (Jul.-Aug., 1986): 311-18.
- Haro, Eduardo. «Margarita Xirgu, en Barcelona: *Doña Rosita la soltera o el lenguaje de las flores*, comedia en tres actos, de Federico García Lorca.» *La Libertad* (Dec. 19, 1935): 1.
- Hart, Stephen. «The Bear and the Dawn: Versions of *La casa de Bernarda Alba*.» *Neophilologus* 73 (1989): 62-69.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time: A Translation of Sein and Zeit*. Joan Stambaugh, trans. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1996.
- Hernández, Mario. «Historia de la 'rosa mudable' (Con una acotación sobre las orquídeas del nuevo reino de Granada).» *Federico García Lorca e il suo tempo*. Laura Dolfi, ed. Rome: Bulzoni, 1999. 297-304.
- Insúa, Alberto. «De Van Dongen a Sacha Guitry.» *La correspondencia de España* (April 26, 1921): 2.
- . «Los rusos en París: El murciélago de Moscú.» *El Imparcial* (May 29, 1921): 7-8.
- Jiménez-Vera, Arturo. «The Rose Symbolism and the Social Message in *Doña Rosita la soltera*.» *García Lorca Review* 6 (1978): 127-37.
- Johnson, Patricia Altenbernd. *On Heidegger*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2000.
- Jones, Gareth. «Chekhov's Undercurrent of Time.» *Modern Language Review* 64 (1969): 111-21.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Malden, MA, Oxford & Victoria: Anthropos Editions, 1991.
- Levy, Michele Frucht. «Of Time and the River: Lorca's *La casa de Bernarda Alba* and Chekhov's *Tri sestry*.» *La Chispa: Selected Proceedings*. Gilbert Paolini, ed. New Orleans: Tulane UP, 1985. 203-12.

- M., M. «Los teatros. Español. Teatro Artístico de Moscou (sección de Praga). *El jardín de los cerezos*, de Antón Chéjov.» *La Libertad* (March 9, 1932): 3.
- Moguilnyi, Oleg and Galina Tamarli. «Antón Chejov y Federico García Lorca. Puntos de enlace.» *Mundo Eslavo: Revista de Cultura y Estudios Eslavos* 3 (2004): 97-104.
- Nag, Martin. «On the Aspects of Time and Place in Anton Chekhov's Dramaturgy.» *Scando-Slavica* 16 (1970): 23-33.
- Nickel, Catherine. «The Function of Language in García Lorca's *Doña Rosita la soltera*.» *Hispania* 66.4 (Dec., 1983): 522-31.
- Pogson, F. L. «Translator's Notes.» *Time and Free Will. An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness*. London and New York: Swan Sonnenschein and Co. and McMillan, 1910: v-viii.
- Proehl, Geoff. «Rehearsing Dramaturgy: 'Time is Passing.'» *Journal of Dramatic Theory & Criticism*. 13.1 (1998): 103-12.
- Sagarra, Joan de. «Un jardín centenario.» *La Vanguardia* (Feb. 18, 2004): 26-27.
- Sánchez, Roberto G. «García Lorca y la literatura del siglo XIX: Apuntes sobre *Doña Rosita la soltera*.» *Ínsula* 26.290 (1971): 12-13.
- Stainton, Leslie. *Lorca: A Dream of Life*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1999.
- Tasin, Nicolás. «Antón Chejov (1860-1904).» *España* (May 22, 1919): 12.
- Turner, C.J.G. «Time in *Tri sestry*.» *Canadian Slavonic Papers – Revue Canadienne des Slavistes* 28.1 (Mar. 1986): 65-79.
- Velázquez Cueto, Gerardo. «Adiós al jardín: García Lorca y Chejov.» *Ínsula* 41 (1986): 13.
- Zaragoza, Celia. «Nuria Espert resucita a *Doña Rosita la soltera*.» *La Vanguardia* (Sept. 28, 1980): 93.
- Zdenek, Joseph W. «La mujer y la frustración en las comedias de García Lorca.» *Hispania* 38.1 (Mar. 1955): 67-69.
- Zubarev, Vera. «The Comic in Literature as a General Systems Phenomenon.» *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 1.1 (1999). <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol1/iss1/2>.
- Zubarev, Vera. «Chekhov as the Founder of the Comedy of a New Type.» *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 13.1 (March 2011). <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol13/iss1/>.